HRCWEST
Western Canada's Premier HR Case Competition

Criteria	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Fair 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Needs Improvement 1 Point
Identify Issues *Possible 20pts*	• Key insights into the case are discussed with little repetition • All critical issues are identified • Issue are prioritized based on sound reasoning	• Case is summarized well, key insights mentioned • Most of the critical issues are identified • Issues are prioritized	• Adequate summary of case • Some issues identified, others are alluded to • Focus is on one key issue with passing mention of others	• Basic summary of case is provided, with little analysis • One issue is identified repeatedly • Minimal effort given to prioritizing issues	• Case facts are simply repeated, not summarized • No attempt made to synthesize issues • The critical issues of the case are missed
Solutions *Possible 20 pts*	• Recommendations address all critical issues well • Evidence supports recommendations • Recommendations are realistic • Sound business practices applied • Recommendations creative & reflect workplace culture	• Recommendations cover most of the critical issues • Evidence is used to support some recos • Some recos reflect generic best practices • Decisions justified • Some creativity but reliance on best practices	• One or more good recos, but some issues unaddressed • Minimal evidence to support • Recommendations may not be completely realistic • Recommendations don't fully reflect workplace culture • Solutions lack creativity	• A few issues addressed; but some missing • Little evidence provided for recos • Some recos are unrealistic; don't fit the culture • Decision-making is very vague, scattered thinking • Simplistic solutions	• No real recos • Solutions are suggested, to problems not identified • Recos not at all realistic • Decision making is unclear or divided • Solutions are not articulated clearly or missing

Criteria	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Fair 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Needs Improvement 1 Point
Implementation *Possible 20 pts*	• Fully considered action plan w/realistic timeline for implementation • Comprehensive action plan defined • Sound estimation of costs, with justification • Risks defined + plan to mitigate • Evaluation method for recos is strong • Feasible alternatives identified should 1st plan fail	• Workable action plan with reasonable timeline is offered • Costs estimated, with basic justification • Risks identified & discussed • Evaluation plan mentioned & feasible • Contingency plan mentioned; may be risky or unrealistic	• Timeline is provided but not practical or realistic • Some necessary resources mentioned, some missed • Costs are stated, not well justified • Risks are identified; not accurate or well explained • Eval method is confusing or lacking • Contingency plan confusing or minimal	• Timeline is inappropriate • Action plan misses identifying needed resources • Costs are missing or not justified • Risks are vaguely mentioned • Inadequate evaluation method • No contingency plans evident	• No timeline • Plan not aligned with resources available • No consideration of costs • Risks are not discussed • No eval method is provided • Contingency plan not considered at all
Presentation Delivery *Possible 20 pts*	• Team confident w/ excellent delivery • All team members contributed equally • Presenters spoke clearly, effective volume, pace, tone • Body language, movement supported presentation • No signs pf reading from a script • Engaging, thoughtful delivery	• Team mostly confident in delivery, good overall delivery • Contribution by team members fairly balanced • Most presenters spoke clearly w/good pace • Body language, movement appropriate, not distracting • Mostly engaging with slow or confused moments	• The team displayed some poise w/nervousness • Contribution appeared a bit lopsided • Clear speaking but issues with pacing • Effective use of movement or body language minimal • Some off-script moments, others involved script reading	• Team members struggled w/organization, nervousness, presence at times • Uneven contribution to presentation • Issues with volume, clarity + pacing • Body language and movement distracting at times • Script reading	• Team nervous or disorganized throughout • One team member carried presentation • Voice clarity, volume and pacing made the presentation difficult to follow • Team seemed unprepared/lost during presentatn

Criteria	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Fair 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Needs Improvement 1 Point
Q & A Management *Possible 15 pts*	• Questions were very well-answered, well-informed • Answers consistent w/recommendations • Team members listened well to questions, before responding • Response consistent w/original recos • All team members responded to Qs • Team members showed respect for one another • Excellent ability to "think on their feet"	• Questions all answered; responses explained/supported reasonably well • Most team members responded to questions, some more than others • Team stuck to their original recos when answering • Team members did not appear flustered • Responses to Q's were not always timely/fluid	• Questions answered appropriately, but in a roundabout way • Not all answers were consistent with recommendations • One or two team members responded to most questions • At times, responses were effective, other times clumsy/disorganized • For the most part, members remained calm	• Team was nervous and hesitated when answering • Difficulty understanding questions • Responses were rushed or too slow • Some members dominated • Team unprepared to defend recos • Significant differences or gaps between recos & responses	• Unprepared to answer questions • Questions were left unanswered • Team members showed minimal respect during Q&A period • Lack of confidence in recos was evident • Responses were significantly unbalanced amongst team members
PowerPoint Content *Possible 5 pts*	• Slides easy to read and completely free of errors • Slides appropriate in terms of amount of text on each one • Slides have good mix text + visuals/charts • Content of slides was deliberate, well-chosen and made the points of the recommendations	• Slides easy to read, mostly free of errors • Slides flowed in logical order • Slides had appropriate content and included visuals/charts • Slides could have used some more content to make points • Some slide content was redundant	• Slides sometimes either too text heavy or difficult to read • A few errors were noted in the slides • Content chosen for slides appropriate but dull • Slides not always connected to speaking notes	• Slides had far too much text or the order of slides did not make sense • Errors were distracting • Slides were visually unattractive, not engaging • Difficult to read and comprehend	• Slides contained many errors • Order of slides was confusing and disrupted the presentation • Content on slides was poorly chosen and visually distracting • Slides had irrelevant content